



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

10/24/2004

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/833,866	04/12/2001	Eldon Roth		5185
35236	7590	04/23/2004		EXAMINER
SHAFFER & CULBERTSON, L.L.P.			CORBIN, ARTHUR L.	
1114 LOST CREEK BLVD.				
SUITE 420			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
AUSTIN, TX 78746			1761	

DATE MAILED: 04/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.	09/833,866	Applicant(s)	ROTH
Examiner	Arthur L. Corbin	Group Art Unit	1761

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address —

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3-8-04 84-7-04

This action is FINAL.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Claim(s) 1, 3 - 22, 24, 25 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) 21, 24, 25 is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 1, 3 - 20, 22 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement

### Application Papers

The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is  approved  disapproved.

The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).

All  Some\*  None of the:

Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received  
in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

### Attachment(s)

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892  Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948  Other \_\_\_\_\_

## Office Action Summary

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

There is no antecedent basis in claim 1 for "the added moisture" (claims 1 and 3), which can be corrected by combining claims 1 and 4.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3-13 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roth (5,871,795, columns 5, 6, 8 and 10) in view of Nakayama et al.

Applicant is referred to the reasoning set forth in paragraph No. 4, Paper No. 6.

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Roth (5,871,795).

Applicant is referred to paragraph No. 6, Paper No. 6. Further, the blending, agitating and chipping in Roth (column 7, lines 40-45 and column 8, line 4) is sufficient mechanical action to distribute the moisture and ammonium hydroxide throughout the meat product.

7. Applicant's arguments filed March 8 and April 7, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Although Nakayama et al does not mention distributing ammonium hydroxide throughout the meat, as applicant contends, Roth does, in fact, achieve such a result. This occurs in Roth during the blending, agitating or chipping of the meat containing the ammonium hydroxide. Such a mechanical action will cause the meat and ammonium hydroxide solution to form a uniform blend in a manner substantially equivalent to applicant's claimed mechanical action. This is true regardless of the treatment time used by Roth.

Nakayama et al is merely relied upon for the concept of using ammonia gas and ammonium hydroxide interchangeably in the treatment of comminuted meat. As a result, Nakayama et al is clearly analogous to and properly combinable with Roth.

8. Claims 21, 24 and 25 are allowed.

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Arthur Corbin whose telephone number is (571) 272-1399. The examiner can generally be reached on Monday--Friday from 10:30 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on (571) 272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

A. Corbin/dh  
April 20, 2004



ARTHUR L. CORBIN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

4-20-04